

change efforts and progress over time. Sites will be encouraged to administer the same survey tools at varying time intervals in order to compare pre- and post-technical assistance perceptions. The sites can infer the impact of technical assistance as well as their own capacity to sustain change. The community resident survey should over-represent those who have or likely have had contact with the police in that locality, determined by arrest rates by zip code or neighborhood delineation, race, and ethnicity. The police survey will be disseminated to all sworn and non-sworn officers. The detainee survey shall be comprised of a convenience sample of those who have had recent contact with the police in that locality.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An estimated one to five percent of members of each community will take part in the Survey of Resident Perceptions of Safety and Policing. The COPS Office estimates 50 sites over the approval period of this collection. Based on previous use of the survey at the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University (PCJ), the estimated range of completion for respondents is expected to be between 10 minutes to 15 minutes for completion. An estimated 15% of police officers of each agency will take part in the Survey of Officer Perceptions of Policing and Department/Organization. The COPS Office estimates 50 sites over the approval period of this collection. Based on previous use of the survey by the PCJ, the estimated range of completion for respondents is expected to be between 15 minutes and 20 minutes. Of the detainees offered the opportunity to participate, an estimated 20–25% of detainees will agree to participate in the Survey of Detainee Perceptions of Policing. Based on previous use of the survey the PCJ, the estimated range of completion for detainee respondents is expected to be between five minutes and 10 minutes.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* Surveys will be disseminated to respective CRI sites pre-technical assistance to gather baseline data. For the approval timeframe of this collection, the COPS Office estimates that it will administer the survey to 50 community and agency sites: The COPS Office estimates that it will administer 400 community member and 100 officer surveys per site:

- 400 surveys × 50 sites (20,000 surveys) × 20 minutes = 6,667 hours.

- 100 surveys × 50 sites (5,000 surveys) × 20 minutes = 1,667 hours.
- The total estimated burden associated with this collection is 8,334 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: April 29, 2015.

**Jerri Murray,**  
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S.  
Department of Justice.  
[FR Doc. 2015–10396 Filed 5–4–15; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4410-AT-P

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Sunshine Act Meetings; National Science Board

The National Science Board, pursuant to NSF regulations (45 CFR part 614), the National Science Foundation Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862n–5), and the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b), hereby gives notice of certain CHANGES in the scheduling of two meetings for the transaction of National Science Board business, as noted below. The original notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 2015 (80 FR 24287).

*Webcast Information:* The link is now available.

Public meetings and public portions of meetings will be webcast. To view the meetings, go to <http://www.tvworldwide.com/events/nsf/150505> and follow the instructions.

*Plenary Board Meeting:* The speaker has been identified.

#### Open Session: 11:05–11:25 a.m.

- Presentation by the recipient of the NSB 2015 Vannevar Bush Award, Dr. James Duderstadt.

*Plenary Board Meeting:* An action has been added to the closed session.

#### Closed Session: 8:30–10:30 a.m.

- Awards and Agreements/CPP action items, including RCRV, NOAO, NRAO, Gemini Observatory, and NHMFL.

*Updates:* The link to the NSB's Web page for updates has been changed. Please refer to the National Science Board Web site for additional information. Meeting information and schedule updates (time, place, subject matter or status of meeting) may be found at <http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/meetings/notices.jsp>.

*Agency Contact:* Jennie Moehlmann, [jmoehlma@nsf.gov](mailto:jmoehlma@nsf.gov).

*Public Affairs Contact:* Nadine Lynn, [nlynn@nsf.gov](mailto:nlynn@nsf.gov).

**Ann Bushmiller,**  
Senior Counsel to the National Science Board.  
[FR Doc. 2015–10633 Filed 5–1–15; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2015–0092]

### Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** License amendment request; opportunity to comment, request a hearing, and petition for leave to intervene; order.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of five amendment requests. The amendment requests are for Kewaunee Power Station; Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3; North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2; Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2; Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2; Byron Station, Units 1 and 2; Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2; Clinton Power Station, Unit 1; Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3; LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2; Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2; Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station; Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3; Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2; R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant; Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1; Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1; Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 3; and Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3. The NRC proposes to determine that each amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by June 4, 2015. A request for a hearing must be filed by July 6, 2015. Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is

necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by May 15, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2015–0092. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: OWFN–12–H08, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments” in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kay Goldstein, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–1506, email: [Kay.Goldstein@nrc.gov](mailto:Kay.Goldstein@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments**

*A. Obtaining Information*

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2015–0092 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2015–0092.

- *NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select “ADAMS Public Documents” and then select “Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

- *NRC’s PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC’s PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

*B. Submitting Comments*

Please include Docket ID NRC–2015–0092, facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

**II. Background**

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the NRC is publishing this notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

**III. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission’s regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation

of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish a notice of issuance in the **Federal Register**. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

*A. Opportunity To Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave To Intervene*

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission’s “Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure” in 10 CFR part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC’s PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1–F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (First Floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC’s regulations are accessible

electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one

contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

#### *B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)*

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is

participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an email notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an email notice that provides access to the

document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission,

or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. However, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii).

For further details with respect to this amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (First Floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly-available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS, or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

Dominion Energy Kewaunee, Inc.,  
Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee Power  
Station, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.,  
Docket Nos. 50-336 and 50-423,  
Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3,  
New London County, Connecticut

Virginia Electric and Power Company,  
Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North  
Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2,  
Louisa County, Virginia

Virginia Electric and Power Company,  
Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry  
Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Surry  
County, Virginia

Date of amendment request:  
November 17, 2014. A publicly-

available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14329A313.

*Description of amendment request:*  
This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would revise the Cyber Security Plan (CSP), Milestone 8 (MS8), full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule for the following plants: Kewaunee Power Station; Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3; North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2; and Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*  
As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Criterion 1: The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The amendment proposes a change to the CSP Milestone 8 full implementation date as set forth in the CSP implementation schedule. The revision of the full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related structures, systems or components (SSCs). Rather, the implementation schedule provides a timetable for fully implementing the CSP. The CSP describes how the requirements of 10 CFR 73.54 are to be implemented to identify, evaluate, and mitigate cyber attacks up to and including the design basis cyber attack threat, thereby achieving high assurance that the facility's digital computer and communications systems and networks are protected from cyber attacks. The revision of the CSP implementation schedule will not alter previously evaluated design basis accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, modify the function of the plant safety-related SSCs, or affect how any plant safety-related SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2: The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

A revision to the CSP implementation schedule does not require any plant modifications. The proposed revision to the CSP implementation schedule does not alter the plant configuration, require new plant equipment to be installed, alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Revision of the CSP implementation schedule does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident, and no new equipment failure

modes are created. No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3: The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. The proposed revision to the CSP implementation schedule does not alter the way any safety-related SSC functions and does not alter the way the plant is operated. The CSP provides assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. The proposed revision to the CSP implementation schedule does not introduce any new uncertainties or change any existing uncertainties associated with any safety limit. The proposed revision to the CSP implementation schedule has no effect on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure. Based on the above considerations, the proposed revision to the CSP implementation schedule would not degrade the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to limit the level of radiation to the public.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., 120 Tredegar St., RS-2, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert Pascarelli.

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit 1, DeWitt County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, LaSalle*

*County Station, Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Oswego County, New York*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, et al., Docket No. 50-219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-244, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of amendment request:* August 29, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14241A526.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment requests NRC approval of a change to the Cyber Security Plan (CSP), Milestone 8 (MS8), full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule as approved by the NRC in letters dated August 19, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML11152A037), and October 24, 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13295A467).

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Exelon Generation Company, LLC (EGC) has evaluated whether or not a significant hazards consideration is involved with the proposed amendments by focusing on the three standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92, "Issuance of amendment," as discussed below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The amendment proposes a change to the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Milestone 8 (MS8)

full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule and associated regulatory commitments. The revision of the MS8 implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related structures, systems, or components (SSCs). The revision of the CSP Implementation Schedule will not alter previously evaluated design basis accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, modify the function of the plant safety-related SSCs, or affect how any plant safety-related SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The amendment proposes a change to the CSP MS8 full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule and associated regulatory commitments. The revision of the MS8 full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related SSCs. No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The amendment proposes a change to the CSP MS8 full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule and associated regulatory commitments. The revision of the MS8 full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related SSCs. The proposed amendment has no effect on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above, EGC concludes that the proposed amendment(s) does not involve a significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), and, accordingly, a finding of no significant hazards consideration is justified.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Bradley Fewell, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, Illinois 60555.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Travis L. Tate.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50–346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

*Date of amendment request:* March 12, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15072A052.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment requests revision of the operating license to extend the completion date for full implementation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Cyber Security Plan from July 1, 2016, until the end of December 2017.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment extends the completion date for milestone 8 of the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) implementation schedule. Revising the full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety related structures, systems, or components (SSCs). The implementation schedule provides a timeline for fully implementing the CSP. The CSP describes how the requirements of 10 CFR 73.54 are to be implemented to identify, evaluate, and mitigate cyber attacks up to and including the design basis cyber attack threat; thereby achieving high assurance that the facility's digital computer and communications systems and networks are protected from cyber-attacks. The revision of the CSP Implementation Schedule will not alter previously evaluated design basis accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, modify the function of the plant safety-related SSCs, or affect how any plant safety-related SSCs are operated, maintained, tested, or inspected.

As the proposed change does not directly impact SSCs, and milestones 1 through 7 provide significant protection against cyber-attacks, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not introduce a new mode of plant operation or involve a physical modification to the plant. New equipment is not installed with the proposed amendment, nor does the proposed amendment cause existing equipment to be operated in a new or different manner. The

change to cyber security implementation plan milestone 8 is administrative in nature and relies on the significant protection against cyber-attacks that has been gained through the implementation of CSP milestones 1 through 7. Since the proposed amendment does not involve a change to the plant design or operation, no new system interactions are created by this change. The proposed changes do not result in any new failure modes, and thus cannot initiate an accident different from those previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not affect the performance of any structures, systems or components as described in the design basis analyses. The change to milestone 8 of the cyber security implementation plan is administrative in nature. The proposed change does not introduce a new mode of plant operation or involve a physical modification to the plant. The proposed amendment does not introduce changes to limits established in the accident analysis. Since there is no impact to any SSCs, or any maintenance or operational practice, there is also no reduction in any margin of safety.

As the proposed change does not directly impact SSCs, and milestones 1 through 7 provide significant protection against cyber-attacks, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* David W. Jenkins, Attorney, FirstEnergy Corporation, Mail Stop A–GO–15, 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.  
*NRC Branch Chief:* Travis L. Tate.

Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), Docket No. 50–296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN), Unit 3, Limestone County, Alabama

*Date of amendment request:* January 27, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15040A698.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.4.9, "RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Pressure and Temperature (P/T) Limits." The TVA submitted this license amendment

request to satisfy a commitment to prepare and submit revised BFN, Unit 3, P/T limits prior to the start of the period of extended operation, as discussed in "Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN)—Units 1, 2, and 3—Application for Renewed Operating Licenses," dated December 31, 2003 (ADAMS Accession No. ML040060359).

Specifically, the proposed change affects the current sets of TS Figures 3.4.9–1, "Pressure/Temperature Limits for Mechanical Heat up, Cooldown following Shutdown, and Reactor Critical Operations," and 3.4.9–2, "Pressure/Temperature Limits for Reactor In-Service Leak and Hydrostatic Testing." The proposed change replaces the current set valid up to 20 effective full power years (EFPYs) with a new set valid up to 38 EFPYs, and replaces the current set valid up to 28 EFPYs with a new set valid up to 54 EFPYs.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes are to accept operating parameters that have been approved in previous license amendments. The changes to P/T limit curves were developed based on NRC-approved methodologies. The proposed changes deal exclusively with the reactor vessel P/T limit curves, which define the permissible regions for operation and testing. Failure of the reactor vessel is not considered as a design basis accident. Through the design conservatisms used to calculate the P/T limit curves, reactor vessel failure has a low probability of occurrence and is not considered in the safety analyses. The proposed changes adjust the reference temperature for the limiting material to account for irradiation effects and provide the same level of protection as previously evaluated and approved.

The adjusted reference temperature calculations were performed in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix G, using the guidance contained in Regulatory Guide 1.190, "Calculational and Dosimetry Methods for Determining Pressure Vessel Neutron Fluence," to reflect use of the operating limits to no more than 54 Effective Full Power Years (EFPY). These changes do not alter or prevent the operation of equipment required to mitigate any accident analyzed in the BFN Final Safety Analysis Report.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes are accepted operating parameters that have been approved in previous license amendments. The changes to the P/T limit curves were developed based on NRC-approved methodologies. The proposed changes to the reactor vessel P/T limit curves do not involve a modification to plant equipment. No new failure modes are introduced. There is no effect on the function of any plant system, and no new system interactions are introduced by this change.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed changes are accepted operating parameters that have been approved in previous license amendments. The changes to P/T curves were developed based on NRC-approved methodologies. The proposed curves conform to the guidance contained in Regulatory Guide 1.190, "Calculational and Dosimetry Methods for Determining Pressure Vessel Neutron Fluence," and maintain the safety margins specified in 10 CFR 50 Appendix G.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Dr., WT 6A-K, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Shana R. Helton.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

*Date of amendment request:*

December 11, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14363A158.

*Description of amendment request:*

This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendments would revise Section 2.1.1, "Reactor Core SLs [Safety Limits]," of the Technical Specifications (TSs) for all three units, to lower the value of the reactor steam dome pressure safety limit from the current 785 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) to 585 psig. The proposed lowering of this safety limit

will effectively expand the validity range for the units' critical power correlations and the calculation of the minimum critical power ratio. Specifically, the revised value of 585 psig is consistent with the lower range of the critical power correlations currently in use at the units. The revised value will also adequately bound a pressure regulator failure open transient event. No hardware, design, or operational change is involved with this proposed amendment.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The NRC staff performed its own analysis, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change to the safety limit in TS Section 2.1.1 will continue to support the validity of the existing critical power correlations applied at the units. The proposed TS revision involves no change to the operation of any system or component during normal, accident, or transient operating conditions. The proposed amendment does not involve any modification to plant hardware, design, or operation.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed reduction in the reactor dome pressure safety limit from 785 psig to 585 psig is an administrative change and does not involve changes to the plant hardware or its operating characteristics. As a result, no new failure modes are being introduced.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not introduce a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The margin of safety is established through the design of plant structures, systems, and components, and through the parameters for safe operation and setpoints of equipment relied upon to respond to transients and design basis accidents. The proposed change in reactor dome pressure does not change the requirements governing operation or availability of safety equipment assumed to operate to preserve the margin of safety. The change does not alter the behavior of the plant equipment, which remains unchanged.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on its own analysis, determines that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Dr., WT 6A-K, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Shana R. Helton.

### **Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information for Contention Preparation**

*Dominion Energy Kewaunee, Inc., Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee Power Station, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin*

*Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-336 and 50-423, Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3, New London County, Connecticut*

*Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia*

*Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit 1, DeWitt County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Oswego County, New York*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, et al., Docket No. 50-219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-244, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania*

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Ottawa County, Ohio*

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 3, Limestone County, Alabama*

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama*

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing SUNSI.

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request such access. A "potential party" is any person who intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication of this notice will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The email address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are *Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov* and *OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov*, respectively.<sup>1</sup> The request must include the following information:

(1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice;

(2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party's particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1); and

(3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requester's basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention.

D. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under paragraph C.(3) the NRC staff will determine within 10 days of receipt of the request whether:

(1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and

(2) The requester has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requester satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requester in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requester may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order<sup>2</sup> setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received

<sup>1</sup> While a request for hearing or petition to intervene in this proceeding must comply with the filing requirements of the NRC's "E-Filing Rule," the initial request to access SUNSI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

<sup>2</sup> Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline. This provision does not extend the time for filing a request for a hearing and petition to intervene, which must comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.309.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff after a determination on standing and need for access, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

(2) The requester may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) The presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) officer if that officer has been designated to rule on information access issues.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requester may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party's interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed with the Chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.<sup>3</sup>

I. The Commission expects that the NRC staff and presiding officers (and any other reviewing officers) will

<sup>3</sup> Requesters should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

consider and resolve requests for access to SUNSI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR part 2.

Attachment 1 to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

*It is so ordered.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of April, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Annette L. Vietti-Cook,**  
*Secretary of the Commission.*

**Attachment 1—General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in this Proceeding**

Day	Event/activity
0	Publication of <b>Federal Register</b> notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) demonstration of standing; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requester to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A	If access granted: issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. 2015-09761 Filed 5-4-15; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-74842; File No. SR-NYSEArca-2014-89]

**Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; Notice of Filing of Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of a Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendments Nos. 1 and 2, To List and Trade Shares of Eight PIMCO Exchange-Traded Funds**

April 29, 2015.

**I. Introduction**

On August 15, 2014, NYSE Arca, Inc. ("NYSEArca" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant

to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act" or "Exchange Act")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> a proposed rule change to list and trade shares ("Shares") of the following eight PIMCO exchange-traded funds, pursuant to NYSE Arca Equities Rule 8.600: PIMCO StocksPLUS<sup>®</sup> Absolute Return Exchange-Traded Fund ("StocksPLUS AR Fund"), PIMCO Small Cap StocksPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Strategy Exchange-Traded Fund ("Small Cap StocksPLUS AR Fund"), PIMCO Fundamental IndexPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Exchange-Traded Fund ("Fundamental IndexPLUS Fund"), PIMCO Small Company Fundamental IndexPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Strategy Exchange-Traded Fund ("Small Company Fundamental IndexPLUS Fund"), PIMCO EM Fundamental IndexPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Strategy Exchange-Traded Fund ("EM Fundamental

IndexPLUS Fund"), PIMCO International Fundamental IndexPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Strategy Exchange-Traded Fund ("International Fundamental IndexPLUS Fund"), PIMCO EM StocksPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Strategy Exchange-Traded Fund ("EM StocksPLUS Fund"), and PIMCO International StocksPLUS<sup>®</sup> AR Strategy Exchange-Traded Fund (Unhedged) ("International StocksPLUS Fund") (each a "Fund" and collectively the "Funds"). The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on September 3, 2014.<sup>3</sup> The Commission received no comments on the proposal. On October 15, 2014, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>4</sup> the Commission designated a longer period within which to either approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).  
<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>3</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 72937 (Aug. 27, 2014), 79 FR 52385.  
<sup>4</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).